



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/753,089	01/07/2004	Caidian Luo	HARD1.071A	5413
20995	7590	02/14/2006	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			MARCANTONI, PAUL D	
2040 MAIN STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FOURTEENTH FLOOR				
IRVINE, CA 92614			1755	

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/753,089	LUO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Paul Marcantoni	1755

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11 and 18-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-11 and 18-27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

Applicant's election on 12/2/05 without traverse of Group I claims 1-111 and 18-27 in the reply filed on 10/31/05 (examiner's restriction requirement) is acknowledged.

Claims 1-11 and 18-27 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over all claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,506,248 B1 (Duselis et al.) and 6,346,146 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both teach a cement composite comprising a mixture of both bleached cellulose fibers and un-bleached cellulose fibers (see for example col.5, lines 13-15 of '146 B1).

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11 and 18-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a,b, and e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Gregersen et al. (EP 263723-abstract only), Mai et al. (Journal of Mat'l Science-abstract only), and Mai et al. (Journal of Mat'l Science-abstract only and different article from first Mai citation), Cook et al. '726 B2, Dezutter et al. '217 A1, or '452 B2, or Duselis et al. '248 B1 or '146 B1.

Gregerson (EP '723) teaches a cement composition (ie hydraulic binder such as Portland cement) comprising bleached and unbleached cellulose fibers thus anticipating the instant invention. (see abstract).

Mai (Slow Crack in bleached cellulose forms-abstract) teach a cement comprising bleached and unbleached cellulose fibers thus anticipating the instant invention (see abstract)

Mai (Effects of Water...) teach a cement comprising bleached and unbleached cellulose fibers thus anticipating the instant invention (see abstract).

Cook et al. '726 B2 teaches a cement composite that includes bleached cellulose fibers (col.4 lines 30-35) and further teaches that the cellulose fibers which can be used in a cement composition are derived from chemical, mechanical, or thermal means as well as chemical combinations thereof (col.9, lines 4-5). Therefore, this is inclusive of chemical (bleached) and mechanical (unbleached) treated cellulose fibers in a cement composition thus anticipating applicants' claimed invention.

Dezutter et al. '217 A1 and '452 B2 teach a composition that would appear to comprise bleached and unbleached cellulose fibers that can be used in a cement composition. In Dezutter et al. '217 A1, they teach bleached cellulose pulp (see p.2, paragraph [0015] and the pulp can be blended into the blend unit and the "blend chest" it refers to is inclusive of chemical treated fibers and non-chemical treated fibers which would have been inclusive of bleached and unbleached cellulose fibers thus anticipating the applicants' claimed invention.

Duselis et al. '248 B1 or '146 B1 both teach a cement composite comprising a mixture of both bleached cellulose fibers and un-bleached cellulose fibers (see for example col.5, lines 13-15 of '146 B1). This reference is inclusive of a 102/103 because

the inventive entity of these patents and the applicants is different. An ODP has been made above as well.

Even if not anticipated, all of the references above teach the same components in overlapping amounts thereby rendering applicants claims at least obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Marcantoni whose telephone number is 571-272-1373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Paul Marcantoni
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1755